arXiv:1206.1236v2 [gr-qc] 30 Oct 2012

Trapped Bose-Einstein condensates with Planck-scale induced deformation of the energy-momentum dispersion relation

F. Briscese
Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica Francesco Severi,
Gruppo Nazionale di Fisica Matematica,
Città Universitaria, P.le A. Moro 5, 00185 Rome, Italy.
and
DSBAI, Sezione di Matematica,
Sapienza Università di Roma,
Via Antonio Scarpa 16, 00161 Rome, Italy.

We show that harmonically trapped Bose-Einstein condensates can be used to constrain Planck-scale physics. In particular we prove that a Planck-scale induced deformation of the Minkowski energy-momentum dispersion relation $\delta E \simeq \xi_1 mcp/2M_p$ produces a shift in the condensation temperature T_c of about $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq 10^{-6}\xi_1$ for typical laboratory conditions. Such a shift allows to bound the deformation parameter up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^4$. Moreover we show that it is possible to enlarge $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ and improve the bound on ξ_1 lowering the frequency of the harmonic trap. Finally we compare the Planck-scale induced shift in T_c with similar effects due to interboson interactions and finite size effects.

A general feature of quantum gravitational theories, see Ref.[1] for an introductory reading, is that they imply a deformation of the standard Minkowski free-particle energy-momentum dispersion relation at Planck scale, as in the case of loop quantum gravity [2–6] and noncommutative geometries [7–10]. Such a feature opens a possibility to test experimentally quantum gravitational effects [11]. The free particle deformed dispersion relation can be written in a general form as

$$E(p) \equiv E_0(p) + \delta E(p, m, M_P) \qquad (1)$$

where $E_0(p) \equiv \sqrt{p^2c^2 + m^2c^4}$ is the Minkowski dispersion relation, p the particle momentum, m its rest mass, c the speed of light and M_p the Planck mass. The explicit form of $\delta E(p, m, M_P)$ depends on the details of the quantum gravity model used. For simplicity the relation (1) is assumed to be universal, i.e., is the same for all the elementary particles, including composite particles such as nucleons or atoms when internal degrees of freedom are negligible. Since one should restore the Minkowski dispersion relation well above Planck scale, one should also require that $\delta E(p, m, M_P) \to 0$ when $M_p \to \infty$. Moreover one would like to preserve the interpretation of m as the particle rest mass, and therefore one should impose the additional condition $\delta E(p = 0, m, M_P) = 0$.

In some case the deformation δE can be tested in the ultra-relativistic regime $p \gg mc^2$ by use of astrophysical data. In the specific case of the deformation $\delta E(p, m, M_P) = \eta_1 p^2/2M_p$ such data could be sensitive to a deformation parameter $|\eta_1| \sim 1$ as discussed by many authors [12–16]. We mention that a preliminary analysis of the Fermi Space Telescope data [17–21] is currently underway.

Very recently [22, 23] it was argued the possibility to constrain the functional form of (1) in the nonrelativistic regime using ultra-precise cold-atom-recoil-frequency experiments. Quite generally, in the nonrelativistic regime one can use the following low momentum ($p \sim 0$) asymptotic expansion of $\delta E(p, m, M_P)$ [22, 23]

$$\delta E(p, m, M_P) \simeq \frac{1}{2M_p}\left(\xi_1 mcp + \xi_2 p^2 + \xi_3 \frac{p^3}{mc}\right) \qquad (2)$$

with the real deformation parameter ξ_1 associated to the leading term, ξ_2 to the next leading term, and ξ_3 to the next-to-next leading term.

It might be objected that (2) can be ruled out for macroscopic objects when $\xi_1 \sim 1$. From (2) one has $p^2/2m \lesssim \delta E$ for $p \lesssim p_0 \equiv \xi_1\, c\, m^2/M_P$ so that the deformation δE dominates over the Minkowski kinetic term of all momenta up to p_0. Standard-model particles with $m \lesssim 10^{-16} M_P$ makes δE dominate in the extreme NR limit $p \lesssim p_0 \sim \xi_1\, 10^{-16} mc$. However, for macroscopic objects one can easily have $m \sim M_P$ and $p_0 \sim \xi_1\, mc$ and therefore the deformation δE dominates over Minkowski kinetic term in the entire NR regime. But this would contradict the familiar dynamics of classical NR bodies and therefore rule out (2). This is what is commonly named ”soccer ball” problem, see [24, 25]. Note, however, that (2) is merely the $p \sim 0$ asymptotic expansion of the full deformation $\delta E(p, m, M_P)$, and is thus valid for all momenta up to some p_λ, where p_λ depends on the explicit functional form of δE. For example a deformation

$$\delta E(p, m, M_P, p_\lambda) = \xi_1 \frac{mc\,p}{2M_P} \exp(-p/p_\lambda) \qquad (3)$$

behaves as $\delta E = \xi_1 mc\,p/2M_P$ for $p \lesssim p_\lambda$ and $\delta E \simeq 0$ for $p \gg p_\lambda$. Therefore, to apply (3) to macroscopic bodies one should measure the momenta of extended objects with $p \lesssim p_\lambda$ and this is impossible for sufficiently small p_λ below the lowest measurable momentum for extended bodies. Since one supposes that this is always the case for p_λ, the relation (2) cannot be ruled out for classical macroscopic bodies. We also emphasize how (2) is commonly accepted in the literature [22]-[23].

In the preceding example p_λ acts as a cutoff for the deformation δE, above which Eq.(2) is no more valid. The value of the cutoff p_λ depends on the specific quantum gravity model considered, but in principle it can be arbitrarily small. Therefore, in order to test the validity of Eq.(2) for a general class of quantum gravity models one must capture the effect of the deformation (2) at small momentums $p \lesssim p_\lambda$ for arbitrarily small p_λ.

For that reason it is meaningful to look at the effect of the deformation (2) on the thermodynamic properties of Bose-Einstein consensates (BECs), which are, in the case of uniform free condensates, a collection of particles with $p = 0$ momentum. Moreover, since in the case of harmonically trapped BECs the single particle ground energy is $\hbar\omega/2$ which corresponds to $p = \sqrt{2\hbar m\omega}$ where ω is the frequency of the harmonic trap, one also expects that Planck-scale effects are strongest for uniform ($p = 0$) than for trapped BECs. As we will show, this expectation is confirmed by calculations.

In this Letter we calculate the shift in the critical temperature T_c of a harmonically trapped BEC due to the Planck-scale induced deformation of the dispersion relation (2). The case of non-trapped uniform BECs in a box has been studied in Ref.[26]. Neglecting interboson interactions and finite size effects in the BEC, it has been found that that the leading-order deformation in (2) produces a shift

$$\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq 0.1\,\xi_1 \left(\frac{m^2 c}{\hbar M_P\, n^{1/3}}\right) \ln[N]. \qquad (4)$$

where $\Delta T_c \equiv T_c - T_c^0$ with T_c the critical temperature of the gas with the deformed dispersion relation, T_c^0 the condensation temperature in the undeformed Minkowski case, n the boson number density, m the boson mass, L^3 the volume of the box and $N = nL^3$ the total number of particles. Such a shift is unexpectedly high if compared with the strength of the deformation in (2) which is of order $\delta E/E \simeq \xi_1 p/2cM_P \ll \xi_1 m/M_p \sim 10^{-17}$. For a $^{87}_{37}Rb$ condensate with $N = 10^5$ particles, a particle number density $n \simeq 10^{12}\,cm^{-3}$ and boson mass $m \simeq 150 \times 10^{-27} kg$ one finds $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq 5.6 \times 10^{-5}\xi_1$ [26] but, since $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \propto n^{-1/3}$, such a shift can be even greater for dilute (smaller n) BECs. In fact, in the case of uniform BECs, one can reduce n and enlarge the temperature shift without however making n so small that it invalidates the thermodynamic limit. Alternatively one can increase the number of particles but, since the dependence on N is logarithmic, one should consider huge N to considerably rise the temperature shift. Moreover, the effect of the next-to-leading-term deformation in (2) was found to be $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 = \xi_2 m/M_P$ which is extremely small.

The relevant result (4) encourages a further investigation of the problem. In facts BECs are produced in the laboratory in laser-cooled, magnetically-trapped ultracold bosonic clouds [27], e.g. $^{87}_{37}Rb$ [28], $^{7}_{3}Li$ [29], $^{23}_{11}Na$ [30], $^{1}_{1}H$ [31], $^{87}_{37}Rb$ [32], $^{4}_{2}He$ [33], $^{41}_{19}K$ [34], $^{133}_{55}Cs$ [35], $^{174}_{70}Yb$ [36] and $^{52}_{24}Cr$ [37], ^{84}Sr [38], ^{168}Er [39]. Therefore, to deal with laboratory measurements of $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ one should generalize (4) to the case of trapped BECs.

In the following we will show that in the case of harmonically trapped BECs one has a Planck-induced temperature shift $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \sim 10^{-6}\xi_1$ for the leading order deformation in (2). This allows to bound the deformation parameter up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^4$. Such a bound is four orders of magnitude above the best bound $|\xi_1| \lesssim 1$ obtained with ultra-precise cold-atom-recoil-frequency experiments [22, 23]. However it is notable the possibility to test Planck-scale effects with BECs. We will also discuss the possibility to improve such a bound considering BECs with low values of the harmonic trap frequency ω. Moreover we will compare Planck-scale effects with the shift in the condensation temperature due to finite size effects and to interboson interactions. Finally we will show that the effect of the next to leading order term in Eq.(2) gives an extremely small temperature shift $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 = \xi_2 m/M_p$ and therefore the deformation parameter ξ_2 cannot be bounded significantly.

Let us consider a system composed of N bosons trapped in an external spherically symmetric harmonic potential $V_{ext} = m\omega^2 r^2/2$. We define $\varphi_0(r) \equiv (m\omega/\pi\hbar)^{3/4}\exp[-V_{ext}(r)/\omega\hbar]$ that is the wave function of the ground state of the single particle quantum harmonic oscillator. The condensate distribution at zero temperature is that of N identical bosons in the ground state of a harmonic oscillator $n_c(r) = N|\varphi_0(r)|^2 = N\left(\sqrt{\pi}a_0\right)^{-3}\exp[-m\omega r^2/\hbar]$ [40–42]. The typical size of the support of φ_0 is $a_0 = \sqrt{\hbar/m\omega}$ and represents the size of the condensate at $T = 0$ temperature. The typical size of the thermal cloud at finite temperatures $k_B T \gg \hbar\omega$ is $R_T = a_0\sqrt{2\pi k_B T/\hbar\omega} \gg a_0$ [40–42]. We also remember that in the case of a harmonically trapped BEC the thermodynamic limit is given by $N \to \infty$ and $\omega \to 0$ with $N\omega^3$ finite. Finally we remember that the condensation temperature of the ideal harmonically trapped BEC with the usual Minkowski dispersion relation ($\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi_3 = 0$) in the semiclssical limit $k_B T \gg \hbar\omega$ is given by $k_B T_c^0 = \hbar\omega\left(N/\zeta(3)\right)^{1/3} \gg \hbar\omega$.

The semiclassical energy in phase space of nonrelativistic particles in presence of an external potential is $E(p,r) = mc^2 + p^2/2m + \delta E(p) + V_{ext}(r)$, see [40–42]. By means of this expression the number of bosons in thermal equilibrium N_{th} is given by [40–43]

$$N_{th} = \int \frac{d^3x d^3p}{(2\pi\hbar)^3}\frac{1}{\exp[\beta(E(p,r) - \mu)] - 1}. \qquad (5)$$

The expression (5) allows to calculate the shift in the condensation temperature due to the deformation (2) as follows. We parameterize the energy deformation (2) in the general form $\delta E(p) = \alpha f(p)$ where $\alpha \ll 1$ is a dimensionless deformation parameter. With such a definition the condensation temperature $T_c(\alpha)$ is a function of α. It is obtained by extracting $T_c(\alpha)$ from Eq.(5) with the substitutions $N_{th} = N$ and $\mu = mc^2$, that is

$$\frac{\pi\hbar^3 N}{2} = \int \frac{drdp\, r^2\, p^2}{\exp[\frac{p^2/2m+\alpha f(p)+V_{ext}(r)}{k_B T_c(\alpha)}] - 1}. \qquad (6)$$

Since the lhs of (6) is independent of α one has $\partial_\alpha N = 0$ and after some algebra one obtains

$$\frac{\partial_\alpha T_c(\alpha)}{T_c(\alpha)} = \int drdp\, r^2 p^2 f(p) g(p,r,\alpha) p^2 / \int drdp\, r^2 p^2 \times$$

$$\left[p^2/2m + \alpha\, f(p) + V_{ext}(r)\right] g(p,r,\alpha) \qquad (7)$$

where

$$g(p,r,\alpha) \equiv \frac{\exp\left[\frac{p^2/2m+\alpha\, f(p)+V_{ext}(r)}{k_B T_c(\alpha)}\right]}{\left[\exp\left[\frac{p^2/2m+\alpha\, f(p)+V_{ext}(r)}{k_B T_c(\alpha)}\right] - 1\right]^2}. \qquad (8)$$

We can use this expression to calculate the shift in T_c. Since $\alpha \ll 1$, one has

$$\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_c^0} = \frac{T_c(\alpha) - T_c(0)}{T_c(0)} \simeq \alpha \left(\frac{\partial_\alpha T_c(\alpha)}{T_c(\alpha)}\right)_{|\alpha=0} \qquad (9)$$

and the last term is evaluated by use of Eq.(7) remembering that $T_c(0) = T_c^0$.

We are first interested in the leading term of the deformation (2), that is $\delta E = \xi_1 mcp/2M_P$ which corresponds to $\alpha = \xi_1 m/2M_P \ll 1$ and $f(p) = cp$. In this case the resulting temperature shift is

$$\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq 0.3\, \xi_1\, (m/M_p) \sqrt{mc^2/\hbar\omega N^{1/3}}. \qquad (10)$$

and is finite in the thermodynamic limit, since it depends on ω and N through $N\omega^3$. For a $^{87}_{37}Rb$ condensate in an harmonic spherical potential trap with typical values of $N \sim 10^5$ and frequency $\omega \sim 10\, Hz$ [40–42], Eq.(10) gives $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq 10^{-6}\xi_1$. This is about two order of magnitude smaller than the non-trapped case $\sim 10^{-4}\xi_1$ [26], but still extremely large if compared with the strength of deformation in Eq.(2) $\delta E/E \ll 10^{-17}$. This estimation of the Planck-induced $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ should be compared with current experimental precision in T_c measurements. In high-precision measurements of $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ in $^{39}_{19}K$ [44] due to interboson interactions, the order of magnitude is $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq 5 \times 10^{-2}$ with a $\sigma_{\Delta T_c/T_c^0} \lesssim 10^{-2}$. This allows to bound the deformation parameter up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^4$, which is about four orders of magnitude above the best estimation $|\xi_1| \lesssim 1$ obtained in cold-recoil-frequency experiments [22, 23], but is nevertheless notable.

One can however look for physical situations in which the temperature shift is enlarged and the bound on ξ_1 improved. In Ref.[26] it was argued that in the case of uniform BECs the temperature shift (4) is enlarged in dilute condensates since $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \propto n^{-1/3}$. Let us analyze the case of harmonically trapped condensates. The central density of an ideal trapped BEC is $n_c(0) = N/(\sqrt{\pi}a_0)^3 \propto N\omega^{3/2}$ and it goes to infinitum in the thermodynamic limit. Moreover $n_c(0)$ is strongly suppressed in non-ideal BECs due to interactions (quantum depletion), so it is not useful to parameterize the temperature shift. We can define the following number density $n_T \equiv N/R_T^3 = (N\omega^3/c^3)(mc^2/2\pi k_B T)^{3/2}$ which is the ratio between the number of bosons and the volume occupied by the thermal cloud and is well defined at finite temperatures in the thermodynamic limit. With such a definition one has $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \propto n_T^{-1/6}$, therefore in the case of trapped condensates one can enlarge $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ by reducing n_T which in turns implies to reduce $N\omega^3$. Because of the $-1/6$ exponent the dependence of the temperature shift on n_T is very smooth and it seems that one cannot significantly enlarge $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ reducing n_T. However one has $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \propto \omega^{-1/2} N^{-1/6}$ from which one see that one can enlarge $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ lowering ω. Also note that the dependence of the temperature shift with respect to N is very smooth and one cannot lower N without loosing the validity of the thermodynamic limit, therefore one cannot rise $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ by lowering N. In conclusion in the case of harmonically trapped condensates one can rise Planck-scale effects on T_c and therefore improve the bounds on ξ_1 considering BECs with low n_T, which corresponds to low frequencies ω and low condensation temperatures T_c.

We stress that an improvement of the precision in T_c measurement would also allow to improve the bounds on ξ_1. However, even in the ideal situation of an extremely precise measurement of T_c, in order to constrain Planck-scale effects with condensation temperature measurements one has to deal with the effect of interboson interactions and with finite size effects, which both affect T_c.

The shift in T_c due to interboson interactions is $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq -3.426\, a/\lambda_T$ where $\lambda_T = \hbar/\sqrt{2\pi m k_B T_c^0}$ is the thermal wavelength at temperature T_c^0 and a is the s-wave scattering length [40–42]. Such a shift can be as large as 4×10^{-2} for $a \sim 10^2\, a_0$ and $\lambda_T \sim 10^4\, a_0$ where a_0 is the Bohr radius, and it has been measured in $^{39}_{19}K$ [44] where the data are well fitted by a second order polynomial $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq b_1(a/\lambda_T) + b_2(a/\lambda_T)^2$ with $b_1 = -3.5 \pm 0.3$ and $b_2 = 46 \pm 5$, the second term being due to beyond-MF effects. Therefore in such a case the shift in T_c due to interboson interaction is about four order of magnitude greater than the Planck-scale induced shift for $\xi_1 \sim 1$. This problem may be solved in principle, just tuning the interaction coupling by Feshbach resonances to very small values of a, therefore reducing the contribution of interboson interactions on $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ below the Planck-scale induced shift $\sim 10^{-6}\xi_1$. However this may cause some practical difficulty. In fact, interboson interactions drive bosons to thermodynamic equilibrium and any experiment is limited by the fact that for extremely small interactions equilibrium is never reached.

Finite size effects are due to the finiteness of N in comparison with the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$. The shift in the condensation temperature due to finite size effects is estimated as $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq -0.73\, N^{-1/3}$ [45–47] and typically it is of about 10^{-2}. Therefore, finite size effects are about four order of magnitude larger than the expected Planck-scale induced shift $\sim 10^{-6}$ for $\xi_1 \sim 1$ and typical $N \sim 10^5 - 10^6$. We stress that finite size effects are technologically impossible to be tuned below Planck-scale induced effects at least for existing condensates, since this would require huge $N \gtrsim 10^{30}$ corresponding to extremely small shifts $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \lesssim 10^{-10}$. Thus, in order to measure a deformation parameter $|\xi_1|$ one should predict the finite size contributions to $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ for typical laboratory conditions $N \sim 10^5 - 10^6$ with an accuracy up to $\sim 10^{-6}|\xi_1|$. However, experimental strategies allows to eliminate finite size effects from $\Delta T_c/T_c^0$ measures as in [44]. In fact for each measurement series at a given a and λ_T, a reference measurement is taken with a small $a/\lambda_T \sim 0.005$, same ω and very similar N, hence very similar λ_T. Thus one can eliminate all a-independent systematic errors that usually affect absolute measurements of T_c including uncertainties in the absolute calibration of N and ω as well as the shift due to finite size effects.

We remark that, even if we have traced a possible approach to the problem, dealing with interboson interaction and finite size effects in real experiments is a strong matter which deserves further investigation that will be presented elsewhere [48].

Finally we consider the next to leading order deformation in Eq.(2) which is $\delta E = \xi_2 p^2/2M_p$ and corresponds to $\alpha = \xi_2 m/M_p$ and $f(p) = p^2/2m$. With such a deformation Eq.(9) gives $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq \xi_2 m/M_p$ which is extremely small of order $\sim 10^{-17}$ and does not allow to constrain significantly the next to leading order parameter ξ_2.

In conclusion, the main goal of this Letter has been to show that trapped BECs can be used to constrain Planck-scale physics. In particular we have shown that the leading order dispersion relation deformation defined in Eq.(2) produces a shift in the condensation temperature of about $\Delta T_c/T_c^0 \simeq 10^{-6}\xi_1$ for typical laboratory conditions and such a shift allows to bound the deformation parameter up to $|\xi_1| \lesssim 10^4$. Moreover we have discussed how it is possible to enlarge such a shift and improve the bound on ξ_1 lowering the frequency ω of the harmonic trap. Finally we have compared the Planck-scale induced shift with similar effects due to finite size and interboson interactions.

During the edition of this Letter a similar analysis of the Planck-scale induced temperature shift in trapped BECS has been realized [49, 50]. However, in addition to such analysis, here we give a stronger focus to the the possibility of planning specific experiments that might provide phenomenological constraints on Planck-scale physics.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank M. de Llano, M. Grether and G. Amelino-Camelia for useful discussions during the edition of this Letter. F. Briscese is a Marie Curie fellow of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica Francesco Severi.

---

[1] L. Smolin, *Three roads to quantum gravity* , London, UK: Weidenfeld & Nicolson (2000).
[2] G. Amelino-Camelia and C. Lämmerzahl, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 899 (2004).
[3] U. Jacob and T. Piran, Nature Phys. **3**, 87 (2007).
[4] F. Aharonian *et al.* [HESS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 170402 (2008).
[5] G. Amelino-Camelia, C. Lämmerzahl, F. Mercati, and G.M. Tino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 171302 (2009).
[6] R. Gambini and J. Pullin, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 124021 (1999).
[7] G. Amelino-Camelia and S. Majid, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15**, 4301 (2000).
[8] J. Kowalski-Glikman, Phys. Lett. B **499**, 1 (2001).
[9] O. Bertolami and L. Guisado, JHEP **0312**, 013 (2003).
[10] G. Amelino-Camelia, F. Briscese, G. Gubitosi, A. Marciano, P. Martinetti, and F. Mercati. Phys. Rev. D **78**, 025005 (2008).
[11] G. Amelino-Camelia, Lect. Notes Phys. **541**, 1 (2000).
[12] G. Amelino-Camelia, J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos, D.V. Nanopoulos, and S. Sarkar, Nature **393**, 763 (1998).
[13] B.E. Schaefer, Phys. Rev Lett. **82**, 4964 (1999).
[14] S.D. Biller *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2108 (1999).
[15] T. Kifune, Astrophys. J. Lett. **518**, L21 (1999).
[16] G. Amelino-Camelia, Nature **408**, 661 (2000).
[17] A.A. Abdo, M. Ackermann, *et al.*, Science **323**, 1688 (2009).
[18] J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos, and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **674**, 83 (2009).
[19] G. Amelino-Camelia and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 084017 (2009).
[20] A.A. Abdo *et al.*, Nature **462**, 331 (2009).
[21] G. Amelino-Camelia, Nature **462**, 291 (2009).
[22] G. Amelino-Camelia, C. Lämmerzahl, F. Mercati, and G.M. Tino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**,171302 (2009).
[23] F. Mercati, D. Mazon, G. Amelino-Camelia, J.M. Carmona, J.L. Cortés, J. Induráin, C. Lämmerzahl, and G.M. Tino, Class. Quant. Grav. **27**, 215003 (2010).
[24] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Freidel, J. Kowalski-Glikman, L. Smolin, Phys.Rev. **D84** (2011) 087702, arXiv:1104.2019.
[25] S. Hossenfelder, Phys.Rev.D75:105005, (2007), hep-th/0702016, 2007-02-02.
[26] F. Briscese, M. Grether, and M. de Llano, EPL **98** (2012) 60001. arXiv:1204.4670 [gr-qc].
[27] M. Grether, M. de Llano, S. Ramírez, and O. Rojo, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **22**, 4367 (2008) see esp. Table 3.

[28] M.H. Anderson, J.R. Ensher, M.R. Wieman, and E.A. Cornell, Science **269**, 198 (1995).

[29] C.C. Bradley, C.A. Sackett, J.J. Tollett, and R.G. Hulet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1687 (1995).

[30] K.B. Davis, M.O. Mewes, M.R. Andrews, N.J. van Drutten, D.S. Durfee, D.M. Kurn, and W. Ketterle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3969 (1995).

[31] D.G. Fried, T.C. Killian, L. Willmann, D. Landhuis, S.C. Moss, D. Kleppner, and T.J. Greytak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3811 (1998).

[32] S.L. Cornish, N.R. Claussen, J.L. Roberts, E.A. Cornell, and C.E. Wieman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1795 (2000).

[33] F. Pereira Dos Santos, J. Léonard, Junmin Wang, C.J. Barrelet, F. Perales, E. Rasel, C.S. Unnikrishnan, M. Leduc, and C. Cohen-Tannoudji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3459 (2001).

[34] G. Modugno, G. Ferrari, G. Roati, R.J. Brecha, A. Simoni, and M. Inguscio, Science **294**, 1320 (2001).

[35] T. Weber, J. Herbig, M. Mark, H.C. Nägerl, and R. Grimm, Science **299**, 232 (2003).

[36] Y. Takasu, K. Maki, K. Komori, T. Takano, K. Honda, M. Kumakura, T. Yabuzaki, and Y. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 040404 (2003).

[37] A. Griesmaier, J. Werner, S. Hensler, J. Stuhler, and T. Pfau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 160401 (2005).

[38] G. Ferrari, R. E. Drullinger, N. Poli, F. Sorrentino, G. M. Tino, Phys. Rev. A 73, 023408 (2006); S. Stellmer, Meng Khoon Tey, Bo Huang, R. Grimm, F. Schreck, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 200401 (2009).

[39] K. Aikawa, A. Frisch, M. Mark, S. Baier, A. Rietzler, R. Grimm, F. Ferlaino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 210401 (2012).

[40] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L.P. Pitaevskii, S. Stringari, Rev.Mod.Phys. **71**, 463-512 (1999)

[41] A.S. Parkins, D. F. Walls, 1998, Phys. Rep. **303**, 1.

[42] K. Burnett, 1996, Contemp. Phys. **37**, 1.

[43] Cong-Fei Du,Xiang-MuKong, Physica B**407**(2012)19731977.

[44] R.P. Smith, R.L.D. Campbell, N. Tammuz, and Z. Hadzibabic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 250403 (2011).

[45] S.Grossmann, M. Holthaus, Z. Naturforsch., A: Phys. Sci. **50**, 921 (1995).

[46] W. Ketterle, N. J. van Druten, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 656 (1996).

[47] K. Kirsten, D. J. Toms, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 4188 (1996).

[48] F. Briscese, to be publisched.

[49] E. Castellanos and C. Laemmerzahl, arXiv:1202.3801v1 [math-ph].

[50] E. Castellanos and C. Laemmerzahl, arXiv:1202.3806v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech]